

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ZION T. GRAE-EL, et al.,

CASE NO. C21-1678JLR

11 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

12 v.

13 CITY OF SEATTLE, et al.,

14 Defendants.

15 I. INTRODUCTION

16 Before the court is Defendants the City of Seattle, Officer Ryoma Nichols, and
17 Sergeant Daina Boggs's (collectively, the "City Defendants") motion for judgment on the
18 pleadings. (Mot. (Dkt. # 51); Reply (Dkt. # 67).) Plaintiffs Zion T. Grae-El and Caprice
19 Strange (collectively, "Plaintiffs") oppose the motion in separate filings. (Grae-El Resp.
20 (Dkt. # 54); Strange Resp. (Dkt. # 60).¹) The court has considered the parties'

21
22

¹ Plaintiffs cumulatively submit 27 pages of responsive briefing (*see* Grae-El Resp.;
Strange Resp.), which exceeds their allotment under the local rules, *see* Local Rule W.D. Wash.

1 submissions, the relevant portions of the record, and the applicable law. Being fully
 2 advised,² the court GRANTS the City Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings.

3 II. BACKGROUND

4 This case arises from a report of suspected child abuse made by Natalie Long, an
 5 employee of Seattle Public Schools ("SPS"), to Child Protective Services ("CPS"), a
 6 component of the Washington State Department of Children, Youth & Families
 7 ("DCYF"). (Compl. (Dkt. # 1-1) at 11.³) On November 28, 2018, Leslie Meekins, a
 8 teacher at Dunlap Elementary School, became concerned that one of her students—Ms.
 9 Strange's minor child, A.S.⁴—had been the victim of abuse. (*See id.* at 11, 55.) Ms.
 10 Meekins, who is required by state law to report instances of suspected abuse, evidently
 11 relayed her concerns to Ms. Long. (*See id.*)

12 Based on Ms. Meekins' concerns, Ms. Long "and two other SPS staff" each
 13 questioned A.S. on November 28, 2018 about the suspected abuse in an allegedly
 14

15 LCR 7(e) (providing that "briefs in opposition" to a dispositive motion "shall not exceed twenty-
 16 four pages"). The City Defendants point out Plaintiffs' technical violation, but do not claim to
 17 be prejudiced by it or ask the court to strike the extra pages. (*See Reply* at 1.) Thus, the court
 18 will consider Plaintiffs' full submission but reminds Plaintiffs that, despite their *pro se* status,
 19 they must review and comply with the court's Local Rules, which are available on the court's
 20 website at <https://www.wawd.uscourts.gov/local-rules-and-orders>.

21 ² Mr. Grae-El requests oral argument (*see Grae-El Resp.* at 1), but the court concludes
 22 that argument would not be helpful to its disposition of the motion, *see Local Rule W.D. Wash.*
 23 LCR 7(b)(4).

24 ³ When citing to Mr. Grae-El and Ms. Strange's filings, the court refers to the page
 25 numbers contained in the CM/ECF header.

26 ⁴ The minor children are referred to using their initials. Ms. Strange is the biological
 27 mother of A.G., A.S., and Z.A.G., who is also Plaintiff Zion T. Grae-El's biological son.
 28 (Compl. at 6.) In addition to Z.A.G., Mr. Grae-El is the biological father of E.A.D. and E.M.D.
 29 (*Id.* at 5-7.)

1 unrecorded interview. (*Id.* at 11-12, 35.) During the interview, A.S. allegedly told Ms.
 2 Long that he had been hit in the stomach by his stepfather, Mr. Grae-El, and that he was
 3 experiencing pain in his leg and shin. (*Id.* at 11.) Ms. Long and her colleagues also
 4 observed marks on A.S.’s face that they thought “looked like someone grabbed his face
 5 really hard,” but did not observe any bruising on A.S.’s stomach. (*Id.*) They reported
 6 these observations to Annaliese Ferreria at DCYF, stated that they did not think the
 7 Seattle Police Department (“SPD”) needed to be contacted at that time, and relayed that
 8 A.S. was not expressing a fear of returning home. (*Id.*) Accordingly, the children were
 9 sent home after school. (*See id.* at 11-12.)

10 That evening, Ms. Ferreria, others from DCYF, and SPD Officers Nichols and
 11 Timothy Jones went to Plaintiffs’ home to conduct a “safety assessment.” (*Id.* at 12,
 12 31.⁵) The group apparently spoke only to Mr. Grae-El in a tense exchange in which he
 13 shouted through a closed door and asserted his rights to refuse to permit them to enter his
 14 home. (*Id.* at 14.) Mr. Grae-El did, however, agree to allow each of the children to go
 15 outside, one at a time, to speak with Ms. Ferreria and the SPD officers. (*Id.*) Plaintiffs
 16 allege that, in the course of speaking with Ms. Ferreria, none of the children said “they
 17 did not feel safe at home or were scared to return home, despite [A.S.] and [A.G.] being
 18 asked.” (*Id.*)

19 //

20 //

21 ⁵ The City Defendants dispute that Officer Nichols was present at the Plaintiffs’ home on
 22 November 28, 2018 (*see Reply at 3*), but the court must accept Plaintiffs’ factual allegations as
 true for purposes of this motion. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678.

1 Plaintiffs quote from Officer Jones's "initial report" documenting the November
2 28, 2018 safety assessment and assert that he did not report seeing "any signs of distress"
3 from the children, and though he "could 'see into the [Plaintiffs'] apartment a little bit,'"
4 he "didn't see anything that concerned [him] at the time." (*Id.* at 31 (purporting to quote
5 from Officer Jones' "initial report").) Plaintiffs further allege that Officer Jones did not
6 describe any "dangerous or injurious living conditions," or observe "the children being
7 afraid, [Mr. Grae-El] being aggressive, or even an observed injury." (*Id.*) Nevertheless,
8 Plaintiffs allege that Officer Jones was under "the impression that CPS wanted [him] to
9 grab" one of the children "when he came out or force [his] way in to take the kids." (*Id.*)

10 None of the children were taken that evening and instead remained in the home
11 and attended school the following morning. Ms. Ferreria arrived at Dunlap Elementary at
12 10:45 AM on November 29, 2018, and called for SPD officers to place the children in
13 protective custody, which she stated, "should have been done last night." (*Id.* at 15.) In
14 response, Officer Nichols arrived at Dunlap Elementary sometime between 2 PM and
15 2:50 PM. (*Id.* at 16.) Plaintiffs allege that Ms. Ferreria had already decided at that point
16 that the children should be placed into protective custody and made no effort over the
17 course of the school day "to ascertain any more information about the initial incident, or
18 speak with" Marites Perez-Aniag, the teacher at Dunlap Elementary who allegedly "had
19 the longest and strongest relationship with the family," having taught A.S. the prior
20 school year. (*Id.* at 30.)

21 After Officer Nichols arrived, Ms. Ferreria apparently did conduct a further group
22 interview of Plaintiffs' children with Officer Nichols. (*Id.* at 16.) During that interview,

1 Officer Nichols overheard E.A.D. tell Ms. Ferreria that “scratches on both sides of her
 2 neck and a small scar by her right collarbone . . . were caused by [Ms. Strange] hitting her
 3 with a belt and spatula in a separate incident.” (*Id.*) Neither Ms. Ferreria nor Officer
 4 Nichols recorded these interviews “due to SPD and CPS anticipating [that] a far more
 5 thorough interview” would be conducted at a later time. (*Id.* (quotation marks omitted).)

6 Thereafter, Officer Nichols created a “supplemental report” on November 29,
 7 2018, in which he indicated that he had “screened the incident” with Sergeant Boggs.
 8 (*Id.* at 30 (quoting and paraphrasing from Officer Nichols’ November 29, 2018 report).)

9 Officer Nichols noted that CPS and SPD had been unable to remove the children the prior
 10 evening because Mr. Grae-El’s “aggressive and confrontational demeanor” made it
 11 “unsafe to do so,” and that E.A.D. had “told” him that Ms. Strange “struck her face and
 12 legs with a belt.” (*Id.*) Officer Nichols was able to see a “mark on [E.A.D.’s] left
 13 cheek,” which she confirmed was from Ms. Strange hitting her. (*Id.* at 31.) E.A.D. also
 14 told Officer Nichols “that she had a bruise on her left thigh,” though he was unable to see
 15 this mark because E.A.D. “was wearing pants.” (*Id.*)

16 Officer Nichols then completed a custody without court order (“CWO”) form,
 17 which largely incorporated information from his “supplemental report,” to certify that he
 18 believed probable cause existed to place the children in temporary protective custody
 19 without a warrant. (*Id.* at 31.) On the CWO form, Officer Nichols allegedly stated that
 20 A.S. reported “being struck by” Mr. Grae-El on November 27, 2018; the injury had been
 21 reported to CPS on November 28, 2018; in a subsequent interview with A.S., E.M.D.,
 22 A.G., and E.A.D., the children “reported a pattern of physical discipline often involving a

1 belt"; and E.A.D. had "also reported she was struck by a belt and indicated an injury,"
 2 which Officer Nichols had observed. (*Id.* at 31 (purporting to quote from CWO).)
 3 Accordingly, Officer Nichols concluded "that all 5 children are in danger of physical
 4 harm if returned home." (*Id.* at 31-32.) Without obtaining a warrant, Officer Nichols
 5 then placed the children into protective custody. (*See id.* at 30-32.)

6 Following placement into protective custody, the children were taken to Seattle
 7 Children's Hospital ("Children's") where medical examinations were conducted to assess
 8 whether the children had any physical signs of abuse. (*Id.* at 25-28.) Children's staff
 9 identified what they believed to be signs of abuse and neglect and presented these
 10 findings to DCYF. (*Id.* at 46.) The children were then removed from Plaintiffs' custody
 11 and either sent to a foster home in Bellingham, Washington or to live with their non-
 12 custodial parent. (*See id.* at 17.) A dependency action was also initiated against
 13 Plaintiffs. (*See id.* at 18, 21.)

14 Mr. Grae-El was arrested on January 10, 2019 and subsequently charged with
 15 "with one count of rape of a child in the first degree as to E.A.D., and one count of
 16 assault of a child in the third degree as to A.S.," for allegedly hitting "A.S. with a belt and
 17 spatula." (*See* Verification of State Records (Dkt. # 20), Ex. 3 at 156 (Mr. Grae-El's
 18 motion for relief from his conviction).⁶) Ms. Strange was initially charged with "with
 19 one count of assault of a child in the third degree as to E.A.D." (*Id.*) Mr. Grae-El was
 20

21 ⁶ The court takes judicial notice of records from Plaintiffs' state court proceeding. *See*
 Fed. R. Evid. 201; *see Byrd v. Phoenix Police Dep't*, 885 F.3d 639, 641 (9th Cir. 2018) (taking
 22 judicial notice of documents filed in the § 1983 plaintiff's state court criminal matter to
 determine whether *Heck* applied).

1 separately tried on the rape indictment and acquitted on September 4, 2019. (*Id.* at 156-
 2 57.) Following his acquittal, the State filed an amended information which charged Mr.
 3 Grae-El with three counts of second degree assault (A.S. and E.M.D.) and one count of
 4 third degree assault (A.S.). (*Id.* at 157.) The amended information charged Ms. Strange
 5 with two counts of second degree assault (A.S. and E.M.D.) and one count of third degree
 6 assault (E.A.D.). (*Id.*)

7 Mr. Grae-El and Ms. Strange subsequently accepted a plea agreement whereby
 8 Mr. Grae-El pled guilty to “one count of assault of a child in the third degree (E.M.D.)
 9 and one count of assault in the fourth degree (A.S.),” and Ms. Strange “entered guilty
 10 pleas to two counts of assault in the fourth degree (E.A.D. and A.S.).” (*Id.* at 158.) Mr.
 11 Grae-El alleges that his fourth degree assault conviction was “for hitting [A.S.]’s hand
 12 with his own hand using ‘moderate force.’” (Compl. at 33.) In September 2020, Mr.
 13 Grae-El moved to vacate his convictions on the grounds that he was provided with
 14 ineffective assistance of counsel during the plea process. *See State v. Grae-El*, No.
 15 82306-0-I, 2022 WL 670953, at *3 (Wash. Ct. App. Mar. 7, 2022). After holding an
 16 evidentiary hearing, the trial court denied Mr. Grae-El’s motion in a ruling that was
 17 recently affirmed on appeal. *Id.* at *3, 9.

18 Plaintiffs initiated this action in King County Superior Court on or about
 19 November 19, 2021. (*See* NOR (Dkt. # 1) ¶ 1; Compl. at 1.) The City Defendants
 20 removed this matter from King County Superior Court on December 16, 2021. (*See*
 21 NOR at 1.)

22 //

III. ANALYSIS

The City Defendants construe Plaintiffs' claims against them as including:

(1) First Amendment claims against Officer Nichols for retaliating against Mr. Grae-El for refusing to permit an inspection of his home on November 28, 2018 (Compl. at 49); (2) Fourth Amendment claims against Officer Nichols for judicial deception (*id.* at 48-49); (3) Fourteenth Amendment claims against Officer Nichols for violating their right to familial association without due process (*id.* at 49); (4) claims under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), alleging that the City Defendants suppressed Officer Jones' police report and Officer Nichols' body worn video ("BWV") footage from November 28 and 29, 2018 (*id.* at 53); (5) Fourteenth Amendment claims under *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs. of City of N.Y.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), alleging that the City of Seattle violated Plaintiffs' right to familial association by promulgating SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-7 (*id.* at 54); and (6) claims for intentional infliction of emotional distress ("IIED") under Washington law (*id.* at 50). (Mot. at 5; 21-23.) Plaintiffs do not dispute this formulation, which the court also finds to be a reasonable summation of Plaintiffs' claims. (See generally Grae-El Resp.; Strange Resp.; Compl. at 48-54.)

The City Defendants argue that judgment on the pleadings is appropriate because:

(1) Plaintiffs' judicial deception and familial relations claims are barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994) (Mot. at 7-10), or (2) unsupported by allegations showing that Officer Nichols—or any other SPD officer—lacked probable cause or a reasonable basis to place Plaintiffs' children in protective custody (*id.* at 10-14);

(3) Plaintiffs' *Brady* claims fail “[b]ecause they do not identify anything material in these

1 documents and cannot identify how the lack of disclosure harmed them (*id.* at 14-16);
 2 (4) Officer Nichols and Sergeant Boggs are entitled to qualified immunity (*id.* at 16-18);
 3 (5) Plaintiffs' *Monell* claims rest on a misstatement of SPD Policy and are unsupported
 4 by any underlying constitutional violation (*id.* at 18-21); (6) Plaintiffs' claims against
 5 Sergeant Boggs rest on a theory of supervisory liability, which cannot support a claim
 6 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (*id.* at 21-22); (7) Plaintiffs' First Amendment claims for
 7 retaliation fail because the actions taken against Plaintiffs were reasonable and supported
 8 by probable cause (*id.* at 22); and (8) Plaintiffs fail to plead the required elements of an
 9 IIED claim under Washington law (*id.* at 22-23).

10 The court begins by describing the legal standard that applies to a motion for
 11 judgment on the pleading before turning to consider Plaintiffs' claims, beginning with
 12 their First Amendment retaliation claims.

13 **A. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c)**

14 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(c) provides that “[a]fter the pleadings are
 15 closed but within such time as not to delay the trial, any party may move for judgment on
 16 the pleadings.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c). “Judgment on the pleadings is proper when the
 17 moving party clearly establishes on the face of the pleadings that no material issue of fact
 18 remains to be resolved and that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” *Hal Roach*
 19 *Studios v. Richard Feiner & Co.*, 896 F.2d 1542, 1550 (9th Cir. 1990). In ruling on
 20 motions brought under Rule 12(c), the court considers the complaint, documents over
 21 which the court may take judicial notice, and exhibits attached to the complaint. *See*
 22 *Webb v. Trader Joe's Co.*, 999 F.3d 1196, 1201 (9th Cir. 2021); Fed. R. Civ. P. 10(c) (“A

1 copy of a written instrument that is an exhibit to a pleading is a part of the pleading for all
 2 purposes.”).

3 The standard for dismissing claims under Rule 12(c) is “substantially identical” to
 4 the Rule 12(b)(6) standard set forth in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009).
 5 *Chavez v. United States*, 683 F.3d 1102, 1108 (9th Cir. 2012). To survive a motion to
 6 dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), “a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter,
 7 accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Iqbal*, 556 U.S.
 8 at 678 (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 554, 570 (2007)). “A claim has
 9 facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw
 10 the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.*
 11 Although not a “probability requirement,” this standard asks for “more than a sheer
 12 possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully.” *Id.* “Determining whether a
 13 complaint states a plausible claim for relief will . . . be a context-specific task that
 14 requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Id.* at
 15 679.

16 When considering a motion for judgment on the pleadings, a court may consider
 17 material which is properly submitted as part of the complaint without converting the
 18 motion into a motion for summary judgment. *See Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d
 19 668, 688 (9th Cir. 2001).

20 **B. First Amendment Retaliation**

21 Plaintiffs allege that Officer Nichols’ placement of their children in protective
 22 custody “was in part, direct retaliation” for Mr. Grae-El’s “assertive demeanor” during

1 the November 28, 2018 safety assessment and his decision to decline the DCYF and SPD
 2 officials to enter his home without a warrant. (*See* Compl. at 51.) The City Defendants
 3 argue that Plaintiffs' First Amendment claims must be dismissed because they "have
 4 failed to plead that probable cause was lacking" for Officer Nichols' seizure of the
 5 children and their subsequent arrest. (*See* Mot. at 22.) They further assert that "the fact
 6 of their prosecution, which has not been called into doubt, shows that prior courts have
 7 found probable cause existed." (*Id.* (citing *Nieves v. Bartlett*, ____ U.S. ___, 139 S. Ct.
 8 1715, 1724 (2019))).)

9 "To plead a First Amendment claim for retaliation, a plaintiff must allege
 10 (1) constitutionally protected conduct, (2) retaliatory action sufficient to deter a person of
 11 ordinary firmness from exercising his constitutional rights, and (3) a causal link between
 12 the protected conduct and the retaliatory action." *Pallas v. Accornero*, No.
 13 19-CV-01171-LB, 2019 WL 3975137, at *5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2019) (first citing *Mt.*
 14 *Healthy City Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle*, 429 U.S. 274, 287 (1977); and then citing
 15 *Ford v. Yakima*, 706 F.3d 1188, 1193 (9th Cir. 2013)). "To prevail on such a claim, a
 16 plaintiff must establish a 'causal connection' between the government defendant's
 17 'retaliatory animus' and the plaintiff's 'subsequent injury.'" *Nieves*, 139 S. Ct. at 1722
 18 (quoting *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 259 (2006)). Generally, this causal showing
 19 requires that plaintiffs plead and prove an absence of probable cause for the arrest. *See*
 20 *id.* (requiring that the official's retaliatory motive be a "but-for" cause of the adverse
 21 action).
 22 //

1 As alleged in the complaint, Officer Nichols based his conclusion that the children
2 were “in danger of physical harm if returned home” on the following: Mr. Grae-El’s
3 “aggressive and confrontational demeanor” during the safety assessment; reports that
4 A.S. said Mr. Grae-El hit him on November 27, 2018; his own interviews with the
5 children on November 29, 2018, during which A.S. “described several open slaps across
6 the face,” and E.A.D.’s report that Ms. Strange “struck her face and legs with a belt”
7 causing a “mark on [E.A.D.’s] left cheek,” which Officer Nichols was able to observe,
8 and “a bruise on her left thigh,” which Officer Nichols did not observe because E.A.D.
9 “was wearing pants”; and reports from A.S., E.M.D., A.G., and E.A.D.—Plaintiffs’
10 school-age children—that their parents engaged in “a pattern of physical discipline often
11 involving a belt.” (*See* Compl. at 30-32.)

12 Plaintiffs allege facts that conflict with some, but not all, of the grounds on which
13 Officer Nichols justified removing the children without a court order. For instance, they
14 dispute Officer Nichols’ characterization of Mr. Grae-El’s demeanor during the safety
15 assessment on November 28, 2018 as “aggressive and confrontational,” and characterize
16 it instead as “protective” and “assertive.” (*See* Compl. at 15-16; *see also id.* at 32
17 (alleging that Officer Jones did not record Mr. Grae-El’s conduct as aggressive or
18 dangerous); Grae-El Resp. at 12.) Further, Plaintiffs note that A.S.’s injury was
19 inconsistently described by SPS, DCYF, and SPD officials as arising from either a punch
20 to the stomach, punch to the eye, or an open slap to the face, and also allege that Officer
21 Nichols’ falsely asserted in his report and CWO form that “he observed bruising on
22 EAD’s left cheek.” (*See* Compl. at 30, 48; Grae-El Resp. at 8.) Plaintiffs also fault

1 Officer Nichols for failing to note that E.A.D. initially told Ms. Perez-Aniag that she was
 2 not sure how she got a scratch on her neck but later stated that she received it when either
 3 Mr. Grae-El or Ms. Strange hit her with a belt. (*See* Compl. at 35-36; Grae-El Resp. at
 4 17-18.)

5 Plaintiffs “do not dispute that ‘whoopins’ took place,” however, only that they
 6 caused “markings that meet the definition of abuse.” (*See* Grae-El Resp. at 3.) And they
 7 do not allege any facts that call into doubt that A.S. told numerous adults from SPS, CPS,
 8 and SPD that he was hit by Mr. Grae-El on November 27, 2018. (*See* Compl. at 30.)
 9 Indeed, Plaintiffs allege that an injury was visible on A.S.’s face during the safety
 10 assessment on November 28, 2017. (*See* Compl. at 50 (denying that “injuries were
 11 observed on the face of any child other than [A.S.] during the safety assessment”).⁷)
 12 Plaintiffs also seemingly accept that Officer Nichols at least “overheard” E.A.D. tell Ms.
 13 Ferreria that “scratches on both sides of her neck and a small scar by her right
 14 collarbone . . . were caused by Caprice hitting her with a belt and spatula in a separate
 15 incident” (*see id.* at 16), and acknowledge that E.A.D. told Ms. Perez-Aniag that the
 16 visible scratch on her neck was from being hit with a belt (*id.* at 35-36). (*See also*
 17 Strange Resp. at 3 (conceding that E.A.D. told Ms. Ferreria “that one scratch on her neck
 18 came from” Ms. Strange, but asserting that E.A.D. “[l]ater recanted the collarbone

19
 20 ⁷ In his response, Mr. Grae-El contends that he told either Officer Nichols or Officer
 21 Jones during the safety assessment that the marks on A.S.’s face were caused by a dog. (*See*
 22 Grae-El Resp. at 12, 17.) However, Plaintiffs do not allege any facts in support of this alternate
 dog theory in their complaint and they may not add new facts through a response brief. (*See*
generally Compl.); *see also* Webb, 999 F.3d at 1201 (describing materials the court may consider
 when evaluating a motion under Rule 12(c)).

1 scratch allegation according to [Ms. Perez-Aniag"].) Finally, Plaintiffs do not dispute
 2 that the children collectively “reported a pattern of physical discipline often involving a
 3 belt” to Officer Nichols (*id.* at 31), even though they would characterize this conduct as
 4 lawful parental discipline (*see id.* at 48; *see also* Grae-Resp. at 3 (admitting practice of
 5 “whooping” children)).

6 The court need not accept as true Plaintiffs’ conclusions that their methods of
 7 physically disciplining their children stopped short of abuse, but otherwise accepts as true
 8 their allegations about what Officer Nichols’ investigation revealed. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S.
 9 at 678. Omitting the information Plaintiffs allege Officer Nichols misrepresented, the
 10 court nevertheless concludes that Officer Nichols had “investigated and corroborated”
 11 sufficiently “[s]erious allegations of abuse” to “give rise to a reasonable inference of
 12 imminent danger sufficient to justify taking children into temporary custody,” if the
 13 children might have suffered further harm before a warrant could have been obtained.

14 *See Rogers v. Cty. of San Joaquin*, 487 F.3d 1288, 1294-95 (9th Cir. 2007).

15 Plaintiffs contend that, even if the allegations relayed to Officer Nichols
 16 constituted serious allegations of abuse, Officer Nichols had time to obtain a warrant
 17 before placing the children into protective custody. (*See* Grae-El Resp. at 18.) They
 18 allege in their complaint that Officer Nichols “chose to wait over 14 hours after the
 19 ‘[safety] assessment’ before” removing the children. (Compl. at 32.) That could suggest
 20 a lack of true exigence except that counting the passage of time from the safety
 21 assessment starts the proverbial clock too soon. *See Rogers*, 487 F.3d at 1294-95
 22 (requiring an investigation to corroborate “serious allegations of abuse” before assessing

1 whether, if the abuse is confirmed, there is sufficient time to obtain a warrant).

2 Notwithstanding Ms. Ferreria’s assertion that placement of the children into protective

3 custody “should have been done [the prior] night” (Compl. at 15), it appears from the

4 complaint that Officer Nichols was not able to establish probable cause until after he

5 interviewed the children at their school and learned about the pattern of physical

6 discipline they reported, which did not happen until sometime after 2 PM on the

7 afternoon of November 29, 2018 (*see id.* at 16, 31-32). Only at that point—when there

8 would have been little time to obtain a warrant before the children were to be released to

9 their parents at the end of the school day—does the exigency question become relevant.

10 *See Rogers*, 487 F.3d at 1294-95; *Barnes v. Cty. of Placer*, 654 F. Supp. 2d 1066, 1071

11 (E.D. Cal. 2009) (analyzing exigency based on the time between confirmation of

12 suspected abuse and the close of the school day), *aff’d*, 386 F. App’x 633 (9th Cir. 2010).

13 Given the time of day at which Officer Nichols was able to confirm the serious

14 allegations of a pattern of abuse, including a recent incident of that abuse against at least

15 A.S., Plaintiffs fail to allege facts showing that Officer Nichols acted unreasonably by

16 inferring that the children would be in danger if returned home at the end of the school

17 day. *See Rogers*, 487 F.3d at 1294-95.

18 Because Plaintiffs have not alleged that Officer Nichols lacked probable or

19 reasonable cause to place the children into protective custody without a warrant on

20 November 29, 2018, they fail to state a First Amendment claim for retaliation. *See*

21 //

22 //

1 | *Nieves*, 139 S. Ct. at 1722.⁸ The City Defendants' motion as to these claims is therefore
 2 | GRANTED and Plaintiffs' First Amendment claims for retaliation are DISMISSED
 3 | without prejudice.

4 | **C. Plaintiffs' Fourth Amendment Claim for Judicial Deception and Fourteenth
 5 | Amendment Claim for Deprivation of Familial Association**

6 | Plaintiffs allege that Officer Nichols violated their Fourth Amendment rights
 7 | through the preparation of a police report and CWO form that contained material and
 8 | deceptive statements and which served as the basis for removing Plaintiffs' children from
 9 | their custody without a warrant, thereby depriving them of their Fourteenth Amendment
 10 | right to familial association without due process. (*See* Compl. at 48-49.⁹) The City
 11 | Defendants assert that these claims must be dismissed because they are barred under
 12 | *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994). (*See* Mot. at 7-10.)

13 | In *Heck v. Humphrey*, the Supreme Court held that a § 1983 damages action "must
 14 | be dismissed" where it will "necessarily imply the invalidity of" an existing conviction or
 15 | sentence, "unless the plaintiff can demonstrate that the conviction or sentence has already
 16 | //

17 |⁸ Plaintiffs also allege Officer Nichols' retaliation violated SPD Policy Manual
 18 | 5.002-POL-4, which prohibits retaliation against those exercising their constitutional rights. (*See*
 19 | Compl. at 51.) Because Plaintiffs have failed to establish that Officer Nichols retaliated against
 20 | them under the First Amendment, and do not separately develop this alleged violation of SPD's
 21 | anti-retaliation policy, any such claim is also DISMISSED without prejudice.

22 |⁹ Plaintiffs seemingly allege the City Defendants violated RCW 9A.84.040, which makes
 23 | it a gross misdemeanor to knowingly make a false report that is likely to cause an emergency
 24 | response. To the extent Plaintiffs intended to state a claim under this state criminal statute, that
 25 | claim is DISMISSED with prejudice because RCW 9A.84.040 provides no enforceable right of
 26 | action to a private citizen. *See also Keyter v. 230 Gov't Officers*, 372 F. Supp. 2d 604, 611
 27 | (W.D. Wash. 2005) ("[T]here no private right of action in the criminal law."), *aff'd sub nom.*
 28 | *Keyter v. Locke*, 182 F. App'x 684 (9th Cir. 2006).

1 been invalidated.” *Heck*, 512 U.S. at 487; *see also Muhammad v. Close*, 540 U.S. 749,
 2 751 (2004) (“[W]here success in a . . . § 1983 damages action would implicitly question
 3 the validity of conviction or duration of sentence, the litigant must first achieve favorable
 4 termination of his available state, or federal habeas, opportunities to challenge the
 5 underlying conviction or sentence.”). Thus, where a conviction stands, a claim that is
 6 “fundamentally inconsistent with the unlawful behavior for which section 1983 damages
 7 are sought,” will be barred by *Heck*. *See Beets v. Cnty. of Los Angeles*, 669 F.3d 1038,
 8 1042 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Smith v. City of Hemet*, 394 F.3d 689, 695 (9th Cir. 2005)
 9 (en banc)). When the underlying conviction is the result of a guilty plea, and not a
 10 verdict following trial, the court must similarly determine whether success in the § 1983
 11 action would undermine the validity of the plea agreement. *See City of Hemet*, 394 F.3d
 12 at 699; *see also Hooper v. Cnty. of San Diego*, 629 F.3d 1127, 1133 (9th Cir. 2011). It is
 13 the defendants’ burden to establish that *Heck* applies by showing that “success in the
 14 action would necessarily imply the invalidity of a criminal conviction.” *Washington v.*
 15 *Los Angeles Cnty. Sheriff’s Dep’t*, 833 F.3d 1048, 1056 n.5 (9th Cir. 2016).

16 The parties do not dispute that, at present, Mr. Grae-El’s convictions for third and
 17 fourth degree assault and Ms. Strange’s convictions for fourth degree assault remain in
 18 effect. Thus, the question before the court is whether Plaintiffs would impugn those
 19 convictions by prevailing in this action on their Fourth or Fourteenth Amendment claims.
 20 *See Beets*, 669 F.3d at 1042. The City Defendants argue that success in this matter would
 21 do precisely that because Plaintiffs (1) “were charged with assault for the ‘whoopins’”
 22 which A.S. and E.A.D., and E.M.D. (as well as A.G.) reported to Officer Nichols”;

1 (2) subsequently pled guilty to assaulting their children; and, thus, (3) “[a] finding in
 2 Plaintiffs’ favor . . . would require” a declaration from the court “that the factual
 3 predicate for Plaintiffs’ guilty pleas (that they abused A.S., E.A.D., and E.M.D.) was
 4 false.” (Mot. at 9.) The court agrees.

5 As a legal matter, it seems inescapable that, in order to have success on their
 6 judicial deception claims, Plaintiffs must demonstrate that Officer Nichols lacked
 7 probable cause because establishing that fact is an essential element of their claims. *See*
 8 *Ewing v. City of Stockton*, 588 F.3d 1218, 1224 (9th Cir. 2009) (establishing that judicial
 9 deception claim cannot prevail where the challenged affidavit “on its face establishes
 10 probable cause”). Likewise, Plaintiffs will only prevail on their familial association
 11 claims if they can establish that Officer Nichols lacked “reasonable cause to believe that”
 12 Plaintiffs’ children were “likely to experience serious bodily harm *in the time that would*
 13 *be required to obtain a warrant.*” *Kirkpatrick v. Cnty. of Washoe*, 843 F.3d 784, 790 (9th
 14 Cir. 2016) (emphasis in original) (quoting *Rogers*, 487 F.3d at 1295).¹⁰ Accordingly,
 15 Plaintiffs broadly allege that Officer Nichols lacked any reasonable basis to act because
 16 he intentionally mischaracterized “parental discipline as abuse” in his reports, which he
 17 then “used to justify the removal of the children” and “to support criminal charges”
 18 against Plaintiffs. (*See* Compl. at 48; *see also id.* at 51 (alleging that when Officer
 19 Nichols decided to take the children into protective custody without a court order, “no
 20 //

21
 22 ¹⁰ “[T]he tests under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment for when an official may
 remove a child from parental custody without a warrant are equivalent.” *Id.* at 789.

1 valid claim of abuse had been made by any child to SPD, only lawful parental
 2 discipline”.)

3 If proven, these allegations would “implicitly question the validity” of Plaintiffs’
 4 existing guilty pleas for assaulting their children because they would directly challenge
 5 whether probable cause existed for their underlying arrest. *See Muhammad*, 540 U.S. at
 6 751. “There is no question that *Heck* bars” challenges that would call into question
 7 whether defendants had probable cause to either effectuate the § 1983 plaintiff’s arrest or
 8 to bring criminal charges against him. *See Smithart*, 79 F.3d at 952. Accordingly, under
 9 *Heck*, Plaintiffs’ Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims cannot proceed. *See id.*
 10 (affirming dismissal on *Heck* grounds where plaintiff sought to invalidate his conviction
 11 “expressly or by implication”).

12 Mr. Grae-El attempts to argue that his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims
 13 are sufficiently factually distinct and should not be barred by *Heck* because neither the
 14 facts of his third degree assault charge (for hitting A.S.’s hand) nor his fourth degree
 15 assault charge (for assaulting E.M.D.) played any role in Officer Nichols’ November 29,
 16 2018 abuse findings or Mr. Grae-El’s subsequent arrest. (*See* Grae-El Resp. at 14-15.)
 17 Thus, he argues that success on his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims would not
 18 call into doubt the validity of his guilty pleas, as his convictions pertain to separate
 19 instances of child abuse not considered by Officer Nichols in making his determination to
 20 place the children in protective custody. (*See id.*) Mr. Grae-El correctly notes that, as
 21 alleged, Officer Nichols did not base his abuse determination on a specific allegation that
 22 Mr. Grae-El hit A.S. on the hand, though he did rely on reports that Mr. Grae-El hit A.S.

1 and that Plaintiffs generally engaged in “a pattern of physical discipline” amounting to
2 physical abuse. (See Compl. at 30-32 (describing the allegations Officer Nichols
3 included in his November 29, 2018 report and on the CWO form).) Officer Nichols’
4 finding that Plaintiffs engaged in a pattern of abusive physical discipline was both central
5 to his probable cause finding and is at the heart of Plaintiffs’ Fourth and Fourteenth
6 Amendment claims. (See *id.* at 48, 51.)

Moreover, records from the state court criminal proceedings, which Mr. Grae-El submits as exhibits to his response brief and over which the court takes judicial notice, further illustrate that Mr. Grae-El’s criminal proceedings pertained to allegations of child abuse during the summer and fall of 2018. (See Grae-El Plea Statement (Dkt. # 54-7 (sealed)) at 8 (explaining that Mr. Grae-El is guilty of assault in the third degree because “on or between 6/1/18 and 11/30/18,” he “committed the crime of Assault 4 DV against my stepson A.S.” by “intentionally commit[ing] an offensive or unwanted touching when [he] was physically disciplining him when I hit his hand”); Information (Dkt. # 54-6 (sealed)) at 2-3 (charging Mr. Grae-El with third degree assault for hitting A.S. with a “belt and spatula” “between November 15, 2018 and November 30, 2018”).¹¹) Those criminal proceedings—and Mr. Grae-El’s ultimate guilty plea—thus arose from the same conduct during the same time frame that Officer Nichols considered when he concluded he had reasonable cause to believe Plaintiffs’ children needed to be placed into protective

¹¹ The court takes judicial notice of these court filings pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201. Fed. R. Evid. 201; *Byrd*, 885 F.3d at 641 (taking judicial notice of documents filed in the § 1983 plaintiff's state court criminal matter to determine whether *Heck* applied).

1 custody to shield them from further abuse. (*See id.*) Thus, Mr. Grae-El challenges
 2 conduct that is not “distinct temporally or spatially from the factual basis for [his]
 3 conviction.” *Beets*, 669 F.3d at 1042. And he does so in a manner that would, if
 4 successful, “implicitly question the validity” of his convictions. *See Muhammad*, 540
 5 U.S. at 751. Accordingly, his Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims are not timely
 6 and may not proceed. *See Heck*, 512 U.S. at 486-87.

7 Ms. Strange also tries in vain to draw a factual distinction between the conduct to
 8 which she pled guilty and that which she challenges through this action. She asserts that
 9 *Heck* does not bar her claims because the factual predicate for the offense to which she
 10 pled guilty could not, as a matter of Washington law, arise out of the same child abuse
 11 fact pattern as her Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims. (*See Strange Resp.* at 5
 12 (“[T]here is no assault 4 of a child charge that exists in Washington.”).) That argument is
 13 unavailing. Washington law certainly permits a parent to be convicted for fourth degree
 14 assault if their physical discipline exceeds the limits of allowable corporal punishment.
 15 *See State v. Redmond*, ___ P.3d ___, 2009 WL 3723831, at *1-3 (Wash. Ct. App. 2009)
 16 (affirming fourth degree assault conviction of father who hit his daughter and then
 17 defended his conduct as lawful parental discipline). Indeed, that is precisely the offense
 18 to which Ms. Strange pled guilty. (*See Verification of State Court Records*, Ex. 3 at 158
 19 (describing Ms. Strange’s guilty plea).)

20 Thus, Ms. Strange’s Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims are *Heck* barred
 21 for the same reason as Mr. Grae-El’s claims: they arise out of conduct that is closely
 22 related to the conduct for which she pled guilty and would, if successful, call into

1 question the validity of her convictions for assaulting her children. *See Muhammad*, 540
 2 U.S. at 751; *Beets*, 669 F.3d at 1042. Indeed, the application of *Heck* is even more
 3 straightforward in Ms. Strange's case. She pled guilty "to two counts of assault in the
 4 fourth degree (E.A.D. and A.S.)" (Verification of State Court Records, Ex. 3 at 158
 5 (describing Ms. Strange's guilty plea)) and now challenges Officer Nichols' probable
 6 cause finding, which was partly based on E.A.D.'s assertion that Ms. Strange hit her with
 7 a belt (*see* Compl. at 33). That sort of direct attack on the probable cause finding
 8 underlying her criminal proceedings is prohibited by *Heck*. *See Smithart*, 79 F.3d at 952.

9 For the reasons given above, Plaintiffs Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims
 10 have not yet accrued and are thus barred under *Heck*, 512 U.S. at 486-87.¹² Plaintiffs
 11 may be able to assert these claims if they successfully invalidate their convictions. *See*
 12 *Trimble v. City of Santa Rosa*, 49 F.3d 583, 585 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, the City
 13 Defendants' motion as to Plaintiffs' Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment claims is
 14 therefore GRANTED, and those claims are DISMISSED without prejudice.

15 D. **Evidentiary Suppression Under *Brady v. Maryland***

16 Plaintiffs additionally allege that they were not given two pieces of exculpatory or
 17 impeachment evidence in the discovery produced as part of their criminal proceeding or
 18 in the course of their dependency proceeding. (*See* Compl. at 53.) Specifically, Plaintiffs
 19
 20

21 ¹² Because the court finds that these claims are barred under *Heck*, it does not consider
 22 whether these claims have been adequately pled or, if they are, whether Officer Nichols or
 Sergeant Boggs enjoy qualified immunity. Likewise, the court does not consider whether
 Plaintiffs have stated a claim for conspiracy to violate these rights, which they mentioned only in
 passing in their complaint. (*See* Compl. at 48.)

1 take issue with the City Defendants' alleged failure to provide them with Officer Jones'
 2 November 28, 2018 report and Officer Nichols' BWV footage from November 29, 2018.
 3 (See *id.*) Plaintiffs mention the attorneys who were allegedly responsible for producing
 4 discovery in those matters only in passing, and neither name them as defendants in this
 5 action nor allege that they possessed the missing information during those proceedings
 6 but failed to provide it to Plaintiffs. (See *id.*) Rather, the gist of Plaintiffs' grievance
 7 regarding this missing evidence seems to be that Officer Nichols failed to consider
 8 mitigating or exculpatory facts when he prepared his November 29, 2018 police report
 9 then used that to draft the CWO form which Plaintiffs believe to be contained in Officer
 10 Jones' report and Officer Nichols' BWV footage. (See Grae-El Resp. at 11 (arguing that
 11 "[t]he omission of this exculpatory evidence from [Officer Nichols'] report was
 12 detrimental to the defense of" Plaintiffs).) Thus, it appears that Plaintiffs' allegations
 13 regarding missing evidence principally serves to buttress their Fourth and Fourteenth
 14 Amendment claims, which challenge Officer Nichols' probable cause determination.
 15 (See Compl. at 53.) Those claims are barred under *Heck*. See *supra* at 12-15.

16 To the extent Plaintiffs intended to state independent claims for withheld evidence,
 17 those are properly construed as claims for the unlawful suppression of exculpatory or
 18 impeachment evidence by Officer Nichols or Sergeant Boggs, in violation of Plaintiffs'
 19 due process rights under *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). (See Compl. at 53; see
 20 also Mot. at 14-16.) "Brady suppression occurs when the government fails to turn over
 21 even evidence that is 'known only to police investigators and not to the prosecutor.'" *Youngblood v. W. Virginia*, 547 U.S. 867, 869-70 (2006). To establish a *Brady* violation

1 for suppression by an investigating officer, plaintiffs must allege that “(1) the officer
2 suppressed evidence that was favorable to the accused from the prosecutor and the
3 defense, (2) the suppression harmed the accused, and (3) the officer ‘acted with deliberate
4 indifference to or reckless disregard for an accused’s rights or for the truth in withholding
5 evidence from prosecutors.’” *Mellen v. Winn*, 900 F.3d 1085, 1096 (9th Cir. 2018)
6 (quoting *Tennison v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 570 F.3d 1078, 1087, 1089 (9th Cir.
7 2009)). Only suppressed evidence that “could reasonably be taken to put the whole case
8 in such a different light as to undermine confidence in the verdict” will suffice to
9 establish such a due process violation. *See id.* (quoting *Kyles v. Whitley*, 514 U.S. 419,
10 435 (1995)).

11 The City Defendants argue that Plaintiffs have failed to state suppression claims
12 under *Brady* “[b]ecause they do not identify anything material in these documents and
13 cannot identify how the lack of disclosure harmed them.” (*See id.* at 14.) Plaintiffs do
14 allege, however, that Officer Jones’ report “is of paramount importance in this case, as is
15 the body cam footage.” (Compl. at 53.) They further explain that they would have used
16 this evidence to rebut Officer Nichols’ assessment that Mr. Grae-El had an aggressive
17 demeanor during the safety assessment on November 28, 2018 and that the children were
18 in distress in Plaintiffs’ care. (*See id.* at 31 (noting that Officer Jones’ report “was absent
19 of any description of the children being afraid, [Mr. Grae-El] being aggressive, or even
20 an observed injury” on the children)).

21 Even if Plaintiffs had been able to make use of Officer Jones’ report and Officer
22 Nichols’ BWV footage in that manner, the court is not convinced that such evidence

1 would have “put the whole case in such a different light as to undermine confidence in
 2 the verdict.” *Mellen*, 900 F.3d at 1096 (quotation marks omitted). As noted above, even
 3 accounting for what this countervailing evidence allegedly shows, Officer Nichols had
 4 sufficiently corroborated allegations of abuse to warrant a finding of probable or
 5 reasonable cause. *See supra* at 12-15. Accordingly, the City Defendants’ motion as to
 6 these claims is GRANTED and Plaintiffs’ *Brady* claims are DISMISSED without
 7 prejudice.

8 **E. SPD’s Liability Under *Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services***

9 Plaintiffs also seek to impose municipal liability against SPD based on its failure
 10 to act to preserve Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights. (*See* Compl. at 53 (first citing *Monell*,
 11 436 U.S. at 694; and then citing *Van Ort v. Est. of Stanewich*, 92 F.3d 831 (9th Cir.
 12 1996).) Plaintiffs allege that SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-2 “is unconstitutional” and
 13 permitted Plaintiffs’ children to be placed into protective custody in violation of their
 14 Fourteenth Amendment rights to familial association. (*See* Compl. at 54.) Specifically,
 15 Plaintiffs take issue with the “subjective opinion clause” in SPD Policy Manual 15.220-
 16 POL-2, which they allege created a “grey area . . . in which discretion is abused and bias
 17 can thrive,” as it did here by allowing Officer Nichols and Sergeant Boggs to “authorize[]
 18 the removal of children without due process.” (*Id.* at 53-54.)

19 SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-2 contains definitions for terms used in section
 20 220 of title 15 of the SPD Policy Manual, which pertains to SPD policies relating to child
 21 welfare. *See SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-2*, Seattle Police Dep’t (May 7, 2019),
 22 <https://www.seattle.gov/police-manual/title-15---primary-investigation/15220---child->

welfare.¹³ Included in that section is a definition for when a “child is in dangerous circumstances.” *See id.* The SPD Policy Manual instructs officers to “determine that a child is in dangerous circumstances based on” three objective factors: (1) “The child’s physical condition”; (2) “The environment where the child is encountered”; and (3) “The time of day and situation where the child is encountered.” *Id.* However, SPD policy provides that the “officer’s subjective opinion is the determining factor if the child is in a dangerous circumstance.” *Id.* Where the officer has “reason to believe, or the child reports, either child abuse or neglect during the investigation of . . . children in dangerous circumstances,” SPD policy requires the officer to then “follow the procedures for investigating child abuse.” SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-6. The procedures for investigating child abuse provide that, before an SPD officer may “take custody of abused or neglected children” without a court order, they must satisfy SPD Policy Manual 15.220-POL-7 and RCW 26.44.050, both of which require that the officer find that “there is probable cause to believe that the child is abused or neglected and that the child would be injured or could not be taken into custody if it were necessary to first obtain a court order pursuant to RCW 13.34.050.” *See* SPD Manual 15.220-POL-7; *see also* RCW 26.44.050.

To establish a municipal liability claim based on the municipalities’ failure “to act to preserve constitutional rights,” a plaintiff must show: (1) that it “possessed a

¹³ The court finds that the contents of Title 15 of the SPD Policy Manual are “not subject to reasonable dispute” and, accordingly, takes judicial notice of the language contained therein. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 201.

1 constitutional right of which he was deprived; (2) that the municipality had a policy;
 2 (3) that this policy ‘amounts to deliberate indifference’ to the plaintiff’s constitutional
 3 right; and (4) that the policy is the ‘moving force behind the constitutional violation.’”
 4 *Van Ort*, 92 F.3d at 835 (quoting *Oviatt v. Pearce*, 954 F.2d 1470, 1474 (9th Cir. 1992)).
 5 To the extent Plaintiffs’ municipal liability claims are based on their Fourth and
 6 Fourteenth Amendment claims, they fail to meet the fourth prong of that test because
 7 *Heck* bars those claims, *supra* at 17-22, and prevents them from “show[ing] an
 8 underlying constitutional violation.” *See Lockett v. Cnty. of Los Angeles*, 977 F.3d 737,
 9 741 (9th Cir. 2020); *see also Foley v. Kaldenbach*, No. 15-CV-1627-CAB-AGS, 2018
 10 WL 325027, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 8, 2018) (dismissing municipal liability claims where
 11 plaintiff’s underlying constitutional claims were barred under *Heck*).
 12 Even if *Heck* did not apply to bar Plaintiffs from establishing an underlying
 13 constitutional violation, their municipal liability claims would nevertheless fail because
 14 Plaintiffs misunderstand what SPD policy requires. As summarized above, even where
 15 an SPD officer’s *subjective* opinion is the determinative factor in concluding that a child
 16 is in a dangerous circumstance, SPD policy nevertheless requires the officer to
 17 *objectively* determine whether the child has been abused and whether it is feasible to
 18 obtain a warrant before placing the child in protective custody. *See* SPD Policy Manual
 19 15.220-POL-6; *id.* at 15.220-POL-7; *see also Nieves*, 139 S. Ct. at 1724 (“[P]robable
 20 cause speaks to the objective reasonableness of an arrest.”); *State v. Graham*, 927 P.2d
 21 227, 233 (Wash. 1996) (“Under both the federal and state constitutions, probable cause is
 22 the objective standard by which the reasonableness of an arrest is measured.”). Where

1 that standard is met, parents whose children are removed will have received all of the
 2 process that is constitutionally due. *See Rogers*, 487 F.3d at 1294 (permitting extra-
 3 judicial removal of a child on a finding of “reasonable cause”); *see also Draper v. United*
 4 *States*, 358 U.S. 307, 311 n.3 (1959) (concluding that “probable cause” and “reasonable
 5 grounds” are “substantial equivalents of the same meaning”).

6 Because SPD Policy does not permit the warrantless removal of children based
 7 purely on an officer’s subjective opinion but, rather obligates SPD officers to make a
 8 constitutionally compliant finding before children can be removed without a court order,
 9 Plaintiffs have failed to allege that SPD policy could be “the moving force” behind their
 10 alleged constitutional violation. *See Van Ort*, 92 F.3d at 835. Accordingly, Plaintiffs fail
 11 in their attempt to establish municipal liability for SPD based on its promulgation of a
 12 policy that failed to prevent Plaintiffs’ alleged constitutional harms. Moreover, because
 13 dismissal of Plaintiffs’ municipal liability claims is based on the court’s determination
 14 that SPD policy requires compliance with the constitution, the court further concludes
 15 that Plaintiffs will be unable to cure the deficiencies in this claim through amendment.
 16 Accordingly, the City Defendants’ motion as to this claim is GRANTED and Plaintiffs’
 17 municipal liability claims are DISMISSED with prejudice. *Eminence Cap., LLC v.*
 18 *Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003) (permitting dismissal with prejudice
 19 where amendment would be futile).

20 **F. Sergeant Boggs’ Supervisory Liability**

21 Plaintiffs mention Sergeant Boggs sparingly few times in their lengthy complaint,
 22 but seem to allege that she is liable for unspecified constitutional violations based on:

1 (1) her role as Officer Nichols’ supervisor (*see* Compl. at 31); and (2) her failure to
 2 “advise” Officer Nichols “to record interviews with [Plaintiffs’] children” (*see id.* at 50).
 3 Although section 1983 permits a cause of action against a supervising official in their
 4 individual capacity, based on their “own culpable action or inaction in the training,
 5 supervision, or control of [their] subordinates,” or for their acquiescence in the
 6 constitutional violations of their subordinates, *see Larez v. City of Los Angeles*, 946 F.2d
 7 630, 646 (9th Cir. 1991), Plaintiffs fail to state such a claim here.

8 As with their municipal liability claims, Plaintiffs’ supervisory liability claims
 9 against Sergeant Boggs fails because they have not established an underlying
 10 constitutional deprivation. *See Lockett*, 977 F.3d at 741. Even if Plaintiffs had
 11 established a predicate constitutional violation, however, they fail to allege that Sergeant
 12 Boggs did anything wrong. For instance, although they allege that “[Sergeant] Boggs did
 13 not advise [Officer Nichols] to record interviews with children” (Compl. at 50), they also
 14 make the conflicting allegation that Officer Nichols’ BWV footage captured the
 15 November 29, 2018 “incident” (*see, e.g., id.* at 53). More generally, Plaintiffs’ passing
 16 references to Sergeant Boggs’ involvement fails to allege sufficient facts to “raise [their]
 17 right to relief above the speculative level.” *See Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. Accordingly,
 18 the City Defendants’ motion as to these claims is GRANTED and Plaintiffs’ claims
 19 against Sergeant Boggs are DISMISSED without prejudice.

20 **G. IIED Claim**

21 Finally, Plaintiffs allege that the City Defendants intentionally caused them
 22 emotional distress. (*See* Compl. at 50.) An IIED claim—also known as the tort of

1 “outrage”—has three elements: “(1) extreme and outrageous conduct, (2) intentional or
 2 reckless infliction of emotional distress, and (3) actual result to plaintiff of severe
 3 emotional distress.” *Kloepfel v. Bokor*, 66 P.3d 630, 632 (Wash. 2003). Liability under
 4 this tort is reserved for “conduct ‘which the recitation of the facts to an average member
 5 of the community would arouse his resentment against the actor and lead him to exclaim
 6 ‘Outrageous!’’” *Id.* (quoting *Reid v. Pierce County*, 961 P.2d 333, 337 (Wash. 1998)).
 7 Plaintiffs here allege no facts that would provoke such community outrage; indeed, the
 8 court has concluded that Plaintiffs fail to allege that Officer Nichols lacked probable or
 9 reasonable cause to place the children into protective custody without a warrant. *See*
 10 *supra* at 12-15. Accordingly, the City Defendants’ motion as to this claim is GRANTED
 11 and Plaintiffs’ IIED claim is DISMISSED without prejudice.

12 **IV. CONCLUSION**

13 For the foregoing reasons, the City Defendants’ motion for judgment on the
 14 pleadings (Dkt. # 51) is GRANTED. Plaintiffs’ claims against the City Defendants are
 15 DISMISSED. The court DISMISSES all of Plaintiffs’ claims without prejudice and with
 16 leave to amend, except for their municipal liability claim against SPD and any claims
 17 under RCW 9A.84.040, which the court DISMISSES with prejudice. The court will
 18 provide further guidance to Plaintiffs regarding seeking leave to amend these claims in a
 19 forthcoming order. (*See* 3/8/33 Order (Dkt. # 61) at 2.)

20 //

21 //

22 //

1 Dated this 18th day of April, 2022.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22



JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge